

**REMARKS**

The Examiner's Official Action dated June 26, 1995 has been received and its contents carefully noted. Filed concurrently herewith is a *Request for a One Month Extension of Time* which extends the shortened statutory period for response to October 26, 1995. Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that this response is being timely filed.

Claims 21-40 were pending in the present application prior to the above amendment. Claims 32-33 and 37-40 have been cancelled and claims 21, 24-26 and 29-31 have been amended. Claims 21, 26 and 31 are independent. Accordingly, claims 21-31 and 34-36 are now pending in the present application and, for the reasons set forth in detail below, are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Applicant notes that this application is a continuation of an earlier application (Serial No. 07/993,391) and that the Official Action continues to maintain the rejections asserted in the final Office Action dated July 20, 1994 in that parent application. In response, the claims of the present application have been amended herewith and are believed to be distinguished from the prior art of record as amended. Specifically, the claims as amended recite that the data signal includes a plurality of pulses having a constant pulse width. The data signal having the constant pulse width is applied to the pixel electrodes of the electro-optical device to drive the liquid crystal. To the contrary, Wakai et al. employs a data signal to drive the liquid crystal display that in which the pulse width is not constant. Accordingly, in view of these distinctions, it is believed that the presently pending claims are patentably distinguished over the prior art of record, and clearly over Wakai et al., and reconsideration is requested.


It is further asserted that these amendments do not raise any new issues and are therefore appropriate for entry after final. Specifically, it is noted that the specific format of the data signal (including the number and width of the pulses that form that data signal), which is clarified by the present amendment, has been considered in detail during

the prosecution of the parent application. Accordingly, in view of the earlier consideration and discussion of the limitations recited in the claims as amended, it is respectfully asserted that no new issues are raised by these amendments that would require further consideration or search and therefore that entry after final is proper.

CONCLUSION

For all of the above reasons, it is respectfully asserted that claims 21-31 and 34-36 are now also in proper condition for allowance and reconsideration of the pending rejections is requested. If the Examiner believes that any further discussions would be beneficial in this case, she is invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Eric J. Robinson  
Reg. No. 38,285

Sixbey, Friedman, Leedom & Ferguson, P.C.  
2010 Corporate Ridge, Suite 600  
McLean, Virginia 22102  
(703) 790-9110